

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**DEVELOPMENT OF THE β -GLUCURONIDASE REPORTER GENE SYSTEM
TO STUDY *ACREMONIUM* ENDOPHYTE INTERACTIONS WITH
PERENNIAL RYEGRASS**

A Thesis Presented in Fulfilment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Science in Genetics

at

Massey University, Palmerston North
New Zealand

Karyn Saunders

1997

ABSTRACT

A transformant of the fungal endophyte *Acremonium lolii*, strain Lp19, containing the *gusA* gene under the control of the constitutive *Pgpd* promoter was generated, and assigned the name KS1. Analytical digests and Southern hybridisation showed that this transformant contained a single chromosomally integrated copy of the *gusA* gene. The transformation frequency of Lp19 was found to be very low, and attempts to increase the transformation frequency were unsuccessful.

KS1 was used to artificially infect seedlings of several different genotypes of *Lolium perenne*, all of a single cultivar, 'Nui'. These seedlings were grown into mature plants, and the endophytically produced GUS enzyme was extracted from individual plant tissues. Assays were performed on the enzyme extracts, and the levels determined were used as a measure of endophyte metabolic activity. Alterations of the *gusA* gene in some plants was detected by Southern hybridisation. One alteration was found to result in loss of GUS activity, the other did not appear to alter *gusA* expression.

Levels of transformed endophyte GUS activity were initially compared between clonal plant material of a single genotype. Statistical analysis revealed that no significant differences were detectable for a particular tissue between the different plants. This showed that plant material of identical genotype could be pooled for analysis without the pooling of the individual plants having an affect on the outcome of the analysis.

Next, levels of the transformed endophyte GUS activity were compared between genetically diverse perennial ryegrass plants of cultivar 'Nui'. Significant differences in GUS activity were detected in most tissues tested between the different genotypes, with only the most mature tissue displaying no detectable differences.

Finally, a single plant of each of two individual genotypes was divided into several clonal plants, and the resulting mature plants were pooled in their genotypes for analysis of GUS, peramine, ergovaline and lolitrem B levels. The F test was not particularly sensitive in this experiment, and only one major difference between genotypes could be detected. Despite this, some trends emerged which were found to be consistent with those found in other studies. Metabolic activity and peramine levels were shown to be highest in the leaf sheath tissue, with levels generally decreasing with increasing tissue age. Lolitrem B was found to be highest in leaf sheath tissue also, but with levels increasing in general with tissue age. Ergovaline levels were very low in all tissues. The results presented show the potential of the use of the GUS reporter gene system to study endophyte gene expression *in planta*, and pooling of plants can be carried out to allow simultaneous study of toxin expression.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Firstly I want to sincerely thank my supervisor Professor Barry Scott for his encouragement and guidance, and for taking me into his lab part way through my degree. I really appreciate the support which you gave me, especially in the beginning when we had so many difficulties. Thanks also to my second supervisor Dr Brian Tapper, who agreed to become involved in my project at a late stage and provided helpful discussion and assistance. To Mike Christensen, thankyou for all of your help with cultures, ideas, technical advice, encouragement and more. I am grateful to Associate Professor Stephen Haslett for all of his help with writing and interpreting the statistical analysis of my data, and for discussions on planning experiments. Thanks to Dr Geoff Lane and the technicians at AgResearch Grasslands for your toxin analyses. I acknowledge Dr Jan Schmid's input at the beginning of this project.

To the people in the Scott Base, Lisa, Carolyn, Jo, Austen, Christina and Emily, and to the people from my "old labs", Tania, Dianne, Paul, Carmel, Frances and Pete, thanks for your help and advice, and for the distractions and laughs, even if we did a bit too much of this at times.

To staff and students of the department past and present especially Kirsty, Miranda, Terri, Laura and Rebecca, thanks for your support, and the trips to the "bank" (a.k.a. Options) we have had over the years.

To Peter, thanks heaps for everything! I would have thrown the computer out the window in frustration without your help. Thankyou to Mum, Dad and Matt for your encouragement and the constant entertainment. Thanks to Nana and Ginny for the cakes, letters and the petrol vouchers. To Lorraine and Keith, your encouragement and support

and little Tig. To Miranda & Bodie; Sandra & Ebony; Rose, Chris & Bianca; thanks for the dog walks.

My thanks also to those who provided the very important funding and resources - FoRST, Massey University and the Microbiology and Genetics Department. Thanks also to the Massey University Doctoral Research Committee, especially to Professor Ken Milne, for all your assistance and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	xi
LIST OF FIGURES.....	xii
Chapter 1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 THE BIOLOGICAL IMPORTANCE OF FUNGI.....	1
1.2 <i>ACREMONIUM</i> ENDOPHYTES OF GRASSES.....	2
1.2.1 Taxonomy and Evolution.....	3
1.2.2 Life Cycle and Distribution.....	4
1.3 ENDOPHYTE-HOST COMPATIBILITY.....	7
1.3.1 Variation within <i>Acremonium</i> endophyte isolates.....	7
1.3.2 Variation in the ability of <i>Acremonium</i> endophyte isolates to form associations with grasses.....	8
1.4 BIOLOGICALLY ACTIVE SECONDARY METABOLITES AND THEIR EFFECTS.....	9
1.5 TRANSFORMATION OF FILAMENTOUS FUNGI.....	12
1.6 REPORTER GENE SYSTEMS TO STUDY GENE EXPRESSION.....	15
1.6.1 Use and Characteristics of Reporter Gene Systems.....	15
1.6.2 The GUS Reporter Gene System.....	16

1.7	POTENTIAL APPROACHES TO MANIPULATING THE SYMBIOSES FOR AGRICULTURAL BENEFIT.....	18
1.8	BACKGROUND AND AIMS OF THIS PROJECT.....	19
Chapter 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS.....		21
2.1	FUNGAL STRAINS AND PLASMIDS.....	21
2.2	GROWTH OF FUNGI.....	21
2.3	MEDIA.....	21
2.3.1	Potato Dextrose Media.....	22
2.3.2	Complete Medium.....	22
2.4	COMMONLY USED BUFFERS AND SOLUTIONS.....	22
2.4.1	1 x TBE Electrophoresis Buffer.....	22
2.4.2	1 x TAE Electrophoresis Buffer.....	22
2.4.3	SDS Loading Buffer.....	22
2.4.4	OM Buffer.....	22
2.4.5	ST Buffer.....	22
2.4.6	STC Buffer.....	22
2.4.7	TE Buffer.....	24
2.4.8	10 x Hybridisation Buffer.....	24
2.4.9	20 x SSC.....	24
2.4.10	2 x SSC.....	24
2.4.11	Tris Equilibrated Phenol.....	24
2.4.12	GUS Extraction Buffer.....	24
2.4.13	GUS Assay Buffer.....	24

2.5	DNA ISOLATION.....	24
2.5.1	Large Scale Total Fungal DNA Isolation.....	24
2.5.2	Isolation of DNA Fragments from SeaPlaque Agarose Gels.....	25
2.6	PURIFICATION OF DNA BY PHENOL/CHLOROFORM EXTRACTION.....	26
2.7	PRECIPITATION OF DNA WITH ISOPROPANOL OR ETHANOL.....	26
2.7	DETERMINATION OF DNA CONCENTRATION.....	26
2.8.1	Fluorometric Determination of DNA Concentration.....	26
2.8.2	Mini-gel Method for Determination of DNA Concentration.....	27
2.9	RESTRICTION ENZYME DIGESTION OF DNA.....	27
2.10	AGAROSE GEL ELECTROPHORESIS OF DNA.....	28
2.11	DETERMINATION OF MOLECULAR SIZE.....	28
2.12	PREPARATION OF FUNGAL PROTOPLASTS.....	28
2.13	TRANSFORMATION OF FUNGAL PROTOPLASTS.....	29
2.14	NUCLEAR STAINING OF FUNGAL PROTOPLASTS.....	30
2.15	SOUTHERN BLOTTING AND HYBRIDISATION.....	30
2.15.1	Southern Blotting.....	30

2.15.2	Preparation of Labelled Probe with the High Prime DNA Labelling Kit.....	31
2.15.3	DNA Hybridisation.....	31
2.15.4	Stripping Filters for Re-Use.....	32
2.16	GROWTH AND ARTIFICIAL INOCULATION OF <i>LOLIUM</i> <i>PERENNE</i> PLANTS.....	32
2.17	EXTRACTION OF THE GUS ENZYME FROM PLANT TISSUE.....	33
2.18	β -GLUCURONIDASE ASSAYS.....	33
2.18.1	Quantitative Assay.....	33
2.18.2	Qualitative Assay.....	34
2.19	ANALYSIS OF TOXINS IN PLANT MATERIAL.....	34
2.19.1	Peramine Analysis.....	34
2.19.2	Lolitrems B Analysis.....	35
2.19.3	Ergovaline Analysis.....	36
2.20	STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF DATA.....	36
Chapter 3. RESULTS.....		38
3.1	COTRANSFORMATION OF A HAPLOID STRAIN OF <i>A. LOLII</i>	38
3.1.1	Transformation of Lp19: Experiments 1 and 2.....	38
3.1.2	Transformation of Lp19: Experiment 3.....	39
3.2	NUCLEAR DISTRIBUTION.....	44
3.2.1	Nuclear Distribution in Lp19.....	44

3.3	MOLECULAR CHARACTERISATION OF <i>A. LOLII</i> TRANSFORMANTS.....	44
3.4	ARTIFICIAL INFECTION OF PLANTS, AND THE STABILITY OF KS1 ENDOPHYTE <i>IN PLANTA</i>	47
3.5	DETERMINATION AND COMPARISON OF GUS ACTIVITY IN PLANTS OF IDENTICAL AND DIFFERENT GENOTYPES.....	51
	3.5.1 GUS Activity in Plants of Identical Genotype.....	51
	3.5.2 GUS Activity in Plants of Several Different Genotypes.....	53
3.6	ANALYSIS OF TOXIN AND GUS ACTIVITY DISTRIBUTION.....	59
Chapter 4. DISCUSSION.....		67
4.1	COTRANSFORMATION OF <i>ACREMONIUM</i>	67
	4.1.1 Alteration of the <i>gusA</i> Gene in KS1.....	71
4.2	EFFECT OF PLANT GENOTYPE ON ANALYSES.....	72
	4.2.1 The Effect of Plant Genotype on GUS Activity.....	72
	4.2.2 The Effect of Plant Genotype on Toxin Production.....	73
4.3	METABOLIC ACTIVITY AND TOXIN DISTRIBUTION <i>IN PLANTA</i> ...	74
4.4	SUMMARY AND FUTURE PROSPECTS.....	76
APPENDIX 1 PLASMID MAPS.....		78
APPENDIX 2 RAW DATA AND SAS PROGRAMS.....		81
APPENDIX 3 PAIRWISE COMPARISONS.....		99
REFERENCES.....		106

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Fungal strains and plasmids.....	23
Table 2 Cotransformation of Lp19: Experiments 1 and 2.....	40
Table 3 Cotransformation of Lp1 and Lp19: Experiment 3.....	42
Table 4 GUS activity measured in extracts from perennial ryegrass plants of genotype A.....	54
Table 5 Analysis of variance of endophyte GUS activity within plants of genotype A.....	56
Table 6 GUS activity measured in extracts from perennial ryegrass plants of different genotypes.....	57
Table 7 Analysis of variance of endophyte GUS activity between different genotypes of the same cultivar.....	60
Table 8 Mean toxin and endophyte GUS levels in two different genotypes of the same cultivar.....	62
Table 9 Analysis of variance of toxin and endophyte GUS levels in two different genotypes of the same cultivar.....	63

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1	Life cycle of <i>Epichloë typhina</i> (sexual) and an <i>Acremonium</i> endophyte (sexual) growing symbiotically with tall fescue (<i>Festuca rubra</i>).....	5
Figure 2	Relationship of primary metabolism to the biologically active secondary metabolites believed to play an important role in grass-endophyte associations.....	13
Figure 3	Structures of biologically active secondary metabolites believed to play an important role in grass-endophyte associations.....	14
Figure 4	Hoechst dye-stained Lp19 protoplast nuclei visualised by fluorescence microscopy.....	45
Figure 5	Distribution of nuclei number in protoplasts released from Lp19...	46
Figure 6	Southern hybridisation of KS1.....	48
Figure 7	Hybridisation of <i>gusA</i> to plant reisolates of KS1, and the original inoculum.....	50
Figure 8	Hybridisation of <i>gusA</i> to plant reisolates of KS1, and the original inoculum.....	52
Figure 9a	Mean levels of toxins and GUS measured in genotype A.....	65
Figure 9b	Mean levels of toxins and GUS measured in genotype D.....	66